



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Am
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/988,009	11/16/2001	James De Perna	62225-159	7685
20277	7590	03/08/2005	EXAMINER	
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 600 13TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096				ANANTHANARAYANAN, RAMYA
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2131		

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/988,009	PERNA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ramya Ananthanarayanan	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on November 16, 2001.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 2/1/01 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: Copy of Renumbered Claims.

1. Claims 1-49 have been examined.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The specification lacks a brief description of drawing 11, under 37 CFR 1.74 in the section in the specification labeled "Brief Description of the Drawings". Appropriate correction is required.
3. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).
4. In the claims that applicant presented, there were two claims numbered claim 41.
5. Please see an attached copy of the claims to view the renumbering of the claims that was necessary in order to repair claims with duplicate claim numbers.
6. Applicant must amend the claims in order to repair any issues with dependencies. For example, claim 48 depends on claim 46, but it should depend on claim 47. The examiner will treat the dependencies in the claims based on the dependencies shown in applicant's submitted claims.

7. A series of singular dependent claims is permissible in which a dependent claim refers to a preceding claim which, in turn, refers to another preceding claim. A claim which depends from a dependent claim should not be separated by any claim which does not also depend from said dependent claim. It should be kept in mind that a dependent claim may refer to any preceding independent claim. In general, applicant's sequence will not be changed. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

10. Claim 5 recites the limitation "the method of claim 1" in the first line of the claim. Claim 1 discloses a system; hence there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner will treat the claim as referring to 'the system of claim 1'.

11. Claim 6 recites the limitation "the method of claim 5" in the first line of the claim. Claim 5 depends upon claim 1, which discloses a system. As stated above, claim 5 is also treated as referring to a system. Hence, claim 6 lacks sufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the

claim. The examiner will treat the claim as referring to ‘the system of claim 5’. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

13. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-12, 14, 25-34, 36-42, 49, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ooki et al. (U.S. Patent 5,822,518).

14. With respect to claim 1, Ooki et al. disclose a system for limiting access to the functionality of one or more software applications, comprising:

A first memory configured to store first data related to each of the one or more software applications (column 3, lines 13-18);

The first memory further configured to store second data related to each of one or more users of any of the software applications (column 2, lines 6-10; column 3, lines 18-21); and

A rules checker (item 13) in communication with the software applications and the first memory, said rules checker configured to:

Receive at least one query, said query originating from any particular one of the software applications (column 5, lines 16-20), and

Forward a message to the particular software application in response to the query (column 5, lines 24-25);

Wherein said message provides instructions to the particular software application regarding entitlements of one of the users to access a particular function of the particular software application (column 6, lines 3-9).

15. With respect to claim 3, Ooki et al. disclose a system, wherein the each of the one or more software applications are implemented on one of a mainframe and a distributed computing system (Figure 1, items 10 and 90; A distributed computing system is one in which different functionality that comprises an application may be located in different components of the system. In Figure 1, two different servers are connected via a network in one system in order to carry out the functionality of the system.).

16. With respect to claim 4, Ooki et al. disclose a system, further comprising:

A second memory configured to store proprietary data useful to the particular software application (column 6, lines 14-18), and

Wherein said message provides information to the particular software application regarding authorization to output portions of the proprietary data (column 6, lines 3-9, lines 12-13).

17. With respect to claim 5, Ooki et al. disclose a system, wherein the respective first data for each software application includes an identification of hierarchically arranged functions associated with that software application (column 6, lines 54-61).

18. With respect to claim 6, Ooki et al. disclose a system, wherein the query further comprises information relating to the one of the users and relating to at least one of the functions associated with the particular software application (column 5, lines 16-20), and

Wherein the message relates to that one user's authorization to access the at least one functions (column 6, lines 3-9).

19. With respect to claim 8, Ooki et al. disclose a system, wherein the respective first data for each software application includes an identification of data fields associated with that software application (column 4, lines 31-35).

20. With respect to claim 9, Ooki et al. disclose a system, wherein the query further comprises information relating to one of the users and relating to at least one of the data fields associated with the particular software application (column 5, lines 10-20), and

Wherein the message relates to that one user's authorization to access the at least one field (column 4, lines 31-35; column 6, lines 3-9).

21. With respect to claim 10, Ooki et al. disclose a system, wherein the rules checker is further configured to:

Generate the message based on the query, the first data and the second data (column 6, lines 3-9).

22. With respect to claim 11, Ooki et al. disclose a system, wherein:

The respective second data for each of the users includes at least one role, from among a plurality of roles, associated with that particular user (column 2, lines 18-23), and

The respective first data for each software application includes:

An identification of hierarchically arranged functions associated with that software application (column 2, lines 18-23), and

A description of which of the plurality of roles is entitled to access each of the functions (column 2, lines 18-23).

23. With respect to claim 12, Ooki et al. disclose a system, wherein:

The query includes an identification of a specific one of the users and a specific one of the functions associated with the particular software application (column 5, lines 16-20);

The rules checker is further configured to generate the message based on the query, the first data and the second data (column 6, lines 3-9); and

The message instructs the particular software application regarding that specific user's entitlement to access that specific function (column 6, lines 3-9).

24. With respect to claim 14, Ooki et al. disclose a system, wherein the respective second data for each of the users includes an access level from among a plurality of access levels associated

with that particular user (column 2, lines 18-23), said access level determining an authorization of that particular user to access proprietary data within the second memory (column 2, lines 18-25) and

The rules checker is further configured to generate the message based on the query, the first data and the second data (column 6, lines 3-9).

25. With respect to claim 25, Ooki et al. disclose a method for providing application-level security, said method comprising the steps of:

Storing first data relating to a plurality of software applications (column 3, lines 13-18);

Storing second data relating to a plurality of users of the software applications (column 2, lines 6-10; column 3, lines 18-21);

Receiving a query from a particular one of the software applications (column 5, lines 10-20);

In response to the query, forwarding a message to the particular software application, said message providing instructions to the particular software application regarding entitlements of a particular user to access a function of the particular software application (column 5, lines 24-25).

26. With respect to claim 26, Ooki et al. disclose a method, further comprising the step of:

Generating the message based on the query, the first data and the second data (column 6, lines 3-9).

27. With respect to claim 27, Ooki et al. disclose a method, wherein the query includes an identification of the particular user and the function (column 5, lines 10-20).
28. With respect to claim 28, Ooki et al. disclose a method, wherein the second data includes for each user, one or more of an associated user ID, client name, role, and business level (column 4, lines 23-28).
29. With respect to claim 29, Ooki et al. disclose a method, wherein the first data includes for each software application an identification of associated hierarchically arranged functions and characteristics of those users authorized to access each such functions (column 6, lines 54-61).
30. With respect to claim 30, Ooki et al. disclose a method, further comprising the steps of:
 - Correlating the first and second data to determine authorized functions, said authorized functions being those particular functions of each software application which are accessible by a specified user (column 5, lines 20-25; column 3, lines 20-25);
 - Generating the message based on the query and the determination of authorized functions (column 6, lines 3-9), wherein said query includes an identification of the particular user and the function (column 5, lines 10-20).
31. With respect to claim 31, Ooki et al. disclose a method, wherein the first data includes for each software application an identification of associated data fields and characteristics of entitlements of users to each data field (column 3, lines 20-25).

32. With respect to claim 32, Ooki et al. disclose a method, further comprising the steps of:

Correlating the first and second data to determine authorized data field operations, said authorized operations being those particular operations of each data field which are permitted to a specified user (column 5, lines 20-25; column 3, lines 20-25); and

Generating the message based on the query and the determination of authorized operations (column 6, lines 3-9), wherein said query includes an identification of the particular user and of a predetermined data field (column 5, lines 10-20).

33. With respect to claim 33, Ooki et al. disclose a method, further comprising the steps of:

Storing proprietary data useful to one or more of the software applications (column 3, lines 13-18); and

Storing third data relating to accessibility of the proprietary data (column 3, lines 21-27).

34. With respect to claim 34, Ooki et al. disclose a method, further comprising the steps of:

Correlating the first, second and third data to determine authorized data accesses, said authorized data accesses being those particular data accesses of the proprietary data which are permitted to a specified user (column 5, lines 60-67 to column 6, lines 1-9); and

Generating the message based on the query and the determination of authorized data accesses (column 6, lines 3-9), wherein said query includes an identification of the particular user and of predetermined proprietary data (column 5, lines 10-20).

35. With respect to claim 36, Ooki et al. disclose a method, further comprising the step of:

Administering the first and second data by manipulating one or both of the first and second data according to which of a plurality of clients one or more of the users is associated with (column 1, lines 23-26).

36. With respect to claim 37, Ooki et al. disclose a method, further comprising the step of:

Administering the first and second data by manipulating one or both of the first and second data according to the identity of a particular one of the users (column 2, lines 19-20; column 4, lines 23-28).

37. With respect to claim 38, Ooki et al. disclose a method, further comprising the step of:

Administering the first and second data by manipulating one or both of the first and second data according to which of a plurality of roles one or more of the users is associated with (column 2, lines 19-20).

38. With respect to claim 39, Ooki et al. disclose a method, further comprising the step of:

Administering the first and second data by manipulating all the first data relating to a specific one of the software applications (column 6, lines 54-61).

39. With respect to claim 40, Ooki et al. disclose a method, further comprising the step of:

Administering the first and second data by manipulating all the first data relating to one of a plurality of functions associated with a specific one of the software applications (column 6, lines 54-61).

40. With respect to claim 42, Ooki et al. disclose a method, further comprising:

A non-volatile data store indicating a hierarchical arrangement of the plurality of access levels (column 4, lines 31-35), and

Wherein the rules checker is further configured to consult the data store when determining the authorization of that particular user (column 6, lines 3-9).

41. With respect to claim 49, Ooki et al. disclose a method, wherein the authorization of the particular user to access proprietary data depends, at least in part, on the particular software application identity (column 4, lines 31-35).

42. With respect to claim 50, Ooki et al. disclose a method, wherein the authorization of the particular user to access proprietary data depends, at least in part, on the particular function identity (column 6, lines 12-17).

43. With respect to claim 41, Ooki et al. disclose a computer readable medium bearing instructions for providing application-level security, said instructions being arranged to cause one or more processors upon execution thereof (column 3, lines 63-67) to perform the steps of:

Storing first data relating to a plurality of software applications (column 3, lines 13-18);

Storing second data relating to a plurality of users of the software applications (column 2, lines 6-10; column 3, lines 18-21);

Receiving a query from a particular one of the software applications (column 5, lines 10-20);

In response to the query, forwarding a message to the particular software application, said message providing instructions to the particular software application regarding entitlements of a particular user to access a function of the particular software application (column 5, lines 24-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

44. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

45. Claims 1-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenow et al. (U.S. Patent 5,483,596) in view of Imai et al. (U.S. Patent 5,870,467). The grounds for this rejection can be found in Form 409 corresponding with the PCT application PCT/US01/43116.

46. Claims 2, 13, 15-20, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooki et al. (U.S. Patent 5,822,518) in view of Dustan et al. (U.S. Patent 5,884,312).

47. Ooki et al. and Dustan et al. are analogous art because both are in the field of electronic communication.

48. With respect to claim 2, Ooki et al. do not disclose a system, wherein the first memory is a relational database.

Dustan et al disclose a system, wherein the first memory is a relational database (column 12, lines 55-57).

49. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dustan et al. with the teachings of Ooki et al. in order to receive instructions from scripts at a web server (column 12, lines 57-60).

50. With respect to claim 13, Ooki et al. do not disclose a system, wherein the rules checker logs data relating to an instance in which the specific user is not entitled to access that specific function.

Dustan et al disclose a system, wherein the rules checker logs data relating to an instance in which the specific user is not entitled to access that specific function (column 13, lines 10-15).

51. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dustan et al. with the teachings of Ooki et al. in order to record the processes and activities in the system (column 16, lines 38-40).

Art Unit: 2131

52. With respect to claim 15, Ooki et al. do not disclose a system, further comprising:

An administrative application configured to facilitate administration of the first and second data.

Dustan et al disclose a system, further comprising:

An administrative application configured to facilitate administration of the first and second data (column 8, lines 56-69; column 13, lines 26-28).

53. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dustan et al. with the teachings of Ooki et al. in order to provide a common interface to access disparate data sources (column 4, lines 29-31).

54. With respect to claim 16, Ooki et al. disclose a system further comprising:

Administering the first and second data by manipulating one or both of the first and second data according to which of a plurality of clients one or more of the users is associated with (column 1, lines 23-26).

55. Ooki et al. do not disclose a system, wherein an administrative application administers the data.

Dustan et al disclose a system, wherein the administrative application administers the data (column 8, lines 56-69; column 13, lines 26-28).

Art Unit: 2131

56. The motivational benefits of having combined the teachings of Dustan et al. with the teachings of Ooki et al. are disclosed above.

57. With respect to claim 17, Ooki et al. disclose a system further comprising:

Administering the first data by manipulating one or both of the first and second data according to an identity of a particular one of the users (column 2, lines 19-20; column 4, lines 23-28).

58. Ooki et al. do not disclose a system, wherein an administrative application administers the data.

Dustan et al disclose a system, wherein the administrative application administers the data (column 8, lines 56-69; column 13, lines 26-28).

59. The motivational benefits of having combined the teachings of Dustan et al. with the teachings of Ooki et al. are disclosed above.

60. With respect to claim 18, Ooki et al. disclose a system further comprising:

Administering the first data by manipulating one or both of the first and second data according to which of a plurality of roles a particular one of the users is associated with (column 2, lines 19-20).

61. Ooki et al. do not disclose a system, wherein an administrative application administers the data.

Dustan et al disclose a system, wherein the administrative application administers the data (column 8, lines 56-69; column 13, lines 26-28).

62. The motivational benefits of having combined the teachings of Dustan et al. with the teachings of Ooki et al. are disclosed above.

63. With respect to claim 19, Ooki et al. disclose a system further comprising:

Administering the first data by manipulating one or both of the first and second data according to which of a plurality of roles a particular one of the users is associated with (column 2, lines 19-20).

64. Ooki et al. do not disclose a system, wherein an administrative application administers the data.

Dustan et al disclose a system, wherein the administrative application administers the data (column 8, lines 56-69; column 13, lines 26-28).

65. The motivational benefits of having combined the teachings of Dustan et al. with the teachings of Ooki et al. are disclosed above.

66. With respect to claim 20, Ooki et al. disclose a system further comprising:

Administering the first and second data by manipulating all the first data relating to one of a plurality of functions associated with a specific one of the software applications (column 6, lines 54-61).

67. Ooki et al. do not disclose a system, wherein an administrative application administers the data.

Dustan et al disclose a system, wherein the administrative application administers the data (column 8, lines 56-69; column 13, lines 26-28).

68. The motivational benefits of having combined the teachings of Dustan et al. with the teachings of Ooki et al. are disclosed above.

69. With respect to claim 35, Ooki et al. do not disclose a system, further comprising the step of:

Creating a log entry relating to the message if the message indicates instructions which prohibit the particular software application access to the function.

Dustan et al disclose a system, further comprising the step of:

Creating a log entry relating to the message if the message indicates instructions which prohibit the particular software application access to the function (column 13, lines 10-15).

70. The motivational benefits of having combined the teachings of Dustan et al. with the teachings of Ooki et al. are disclosed above.

Art Unit: 2131

71. Claims 21-24, 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooki et al. (U.S. Patent 5,822,518) and Dustan et al. (U.S. Patent 5,884,312) in view of Sprecher (U.S. Patent 5,285,494).

72. Ooki et al., Dustan et al. and Sprecher are all analogous art because both are in the field of electronic communication.

73. With respect to claim 21, Ooki et al. and Dustan et al. do not disclose a system, further comprising:

An auditing application configured to facilitate auditing of the first and second data and any additional data generated by the rules checker.

Sprecher disclose a system, further comprising:

An auditing application configured to facilitate auditing of the first and second data and any additional data generated by the rules checker (column 5, lines 66-68).

74. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Sprecher with the combined teachings of Ooki et al. and Dustan et al. in order to utilize real-time and historical data for analysis (column 1, lines 54-55).

75. With respect to claim 22, Ooki et al. and Dustan et al. do not disclose a system, wherein the auditing application is further configured to provide a history, upon request, of messages forwarded by the rules checker.

Sprecher disclose a system, wherein the auditing application is further configured to provide a history, upon request, of messages forwarded by the rules checker (column 7, lines 20-22).

76. The motivational benefits of having combined the teachings of Sprecher with the combined teachings of Ooki et al. and Dustan et al. are disclosed above.

77. With respect to claim 23, Ooki et al. and Dustan et al. do not disclose a system, wherein the history emphasizes those messages related to a failed attempt to access the particular function. Sprecher disclose a system, wherein the history emphasizes those messages related to a failed attempt to access the particular function (column 7, lines 30-31).

78. The motivational benefits of having combined the teachings of Sprecher with the combined teachings of Ooki et al. and Dustan et al. are disclosed above.

79. With respect to claim 24, Ooki et al. do not disclose a system, wherein the auditing application is further configured to provide a history, upon request, of changes to one or both of the first data and the second data.

80. Dustan et al. discloses a system, wherein the history consists of changes to one or both of the first data and second data (column 14, lines 24-26).

81. Dustan et al. do not disclose a system, wherein the auditing application is further configured to provide a history, upon request, of any historical data after a certain date.

Sprecher disclose a system, wherein the auditing application is further configured to provide a history, upon request, of any historical data after a certain date (column 8, lines 7-9).

82. The motivational benefits of having combined the teachings of Sprecher with the combined teachings of Ooki et al. and Dustan et al. are disclosed above.

83. With respect to claim 43, Ooki et al. do not disclose a system, wherein the auditing application is further configured to provide real-time data logging and retrieval.

Sprecher disclose a system, wherein the auditing application is further configured to provide real-time data logging and retrieval (column 1, lines 55-61).

84. The motivational benefits of having combined the teachings of Sprecher with the combined teachings of Ooki et al. and Dustan et al. are disclosed above.

85. With respect to claim 44, Ooki et al. and Dustan et al. do not disclose a system, wherein any updates to data within the relational database are performed in real-time and the rules checker is further configured to use the updated data.

Sprecher discloses a system, wherein any updates to data within the relational database are performed in real-time and the rules checker is further configured to use the updated data (column 1, lines 55-61).

86. The motivational benefits of having combined the teachings of Sprecher with the combined teachings of Ooki et al. and Dustan et al. are disclosed above.

87. With respect to claim 45, Ooki et al. discloses a system, wherein the particular software application is configured to:

Provide in the query to the rules checker a user identity and a secured resource identity (column 5, lines 16-20);

Receive from the rules checker the message forwarded by the rules checker (column 5, lines 24-25); and

Determine the entitlements of the user to access the secured resource (column 6, lines 3-9).

88. Ooki et al. and Dustan et al. do not disclose a system, wherein the particular software application is a simulation application.

Sprecher discloses a system, wherein the particular software application is a simulation application (column 1, line 68).

89. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Sprecher with the combined teachings of Ooki et al. and Dustan et al. in order to generate models of optimum conditions for potential market areas (column 4, lines 38-40).

90. Claims 7, 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ooki et al. (U.S. Patent 5,822,518) in view of Dauerer et al. (U.S. Patent 5,627,967).

91. Ooki et al. and Dustan et al. are analogous art because both are in the field of electronic communication.

92. With respect to claim 7, Ooki et al. do not disclose a system, wherein the identification of hierarchically arranged functions include functions, sub-functions, and sub-sub functions. Dauerer et al. disclose a system, wherein the identification of hierarchically arranged functions include functions, sub-functions, and sub-sub functions (column 1, lines 44-50).

93. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dauerer et al. with the teachings of Ooki et al. in order to provide efficient satisfaction of the basic requirements of the system (column 1, lines 44-46).

94. With respect to claim 46, Ooki et al. do not disclose a system, wherein the query requests a listing of entitlements for the one user, said listing identifying the entitlements for every function associated with the one user, and wherein the message includes said listing. Dauerer et al. disclose a system, wherein the query requests a listing of entitlements for the one user, said listing identifying the entitlements for every function associated with the one user, and wherein the message includes said listing (column 2, lines 49-51; column 4, lines 58-60, lines 62-67).

95. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dauerer et al. with the teachings of Ooki et al. in order to defer updating the entire system or larger access lists (column 5, lines 2-6).

96. With respect to claim 47, Ooki et al. do not disclose a system, wherein query includes filtering parameters such that the listing includes only those entitlements that satisfy the filtering parameters.

Dauerer et al. disclose a system, wherein query includes filtering parameters such that the listing includes only those entitlements that satisfy the filtering parameters (column 7, lines 51-53).

97. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dauerer et al. with the teachings of Ooki et al. in order to simplify the maintenance of the master list (column 7, lines 48-50).

98. With respect to claim 48, Ooki et al. do not disclose a system, wherein the filtering parameters specify one or more of a user role, a function identity, an application identity, a user identity, and a data access level.

Dauerer et al. disclose a system, wherein the filtering parameters specify one or more of a user role, a function identity, an application identity, a user identity, and a data access level (column 7, lines 38-50).

99. The motivational benefits of having combined the teachings of Dauerer et al. with the teachings of Ooki et al. are disclosed above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramya Ananthanarayanan whose telephone number is (571) 272-5860. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 -5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RA

Andrew Caldwell
ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER